THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA

W.P.No. 15362 of 1995

DATE: 14-11-2006

Between:

Md. Yousufuddin

..Petitioner.

And

The Superintending Engineer,
Andhra Pradesh State Electricity Board,
Nizamabad and another.

..Respondents

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA

W.P.No. 15362 of 1995

O R D E R:

The petitioner is seeking a direction to the respondents to consider his case for re-engagement as Casual Labour in the existing vacancies.

The petitioner states that he worked as Casual Labour with the respondents for certain period, and thereafter, dis-engaged, and as some vacancies of Casual Labour exist, the petitioner states that he submitted his application, but the respondents instead of considering his case, have considered the cases of his juniors and engaged them as Casual Labour. Hence, he seeks appropriate directions.

The respondents filed counter. The learned Standing Counsel for the respondents, reiterating the counter averments submitted that the petitioner only worked for two days. There is no system of issuing appointment orders, as and when work exists, casual labour are being engaged. The names of ex-causal labour were published in Eenadu, and the names of those ex-casual labour, whose names were not published, were called upon to submit their objections. The petitioner's name did not find place in the publication, and if the petitioner had worked, he should have submitted his objections supported by relevant material, which he did not do. Hence, he prayed that the writ petition be dismissed.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for the respondents.

Though the petitioner contends that he had worked with the respondents as casual labour for some time, the same is disputed by the respondents stating that he worked only for two days. Further, it is the case of the respondents that they published a notification in Eenadu showing the names of those persons who worked as casual labour and called upon the ex-causal labour whose names did not figure in the notification to submit their objections, but the petitioner, who claims that he worked as casual labour, did not submit his objections. Since the petitioner, who claims to have worked as casual labour with the respondents, failed to submit his objections despite his name having not been found in the notification, no direction can be given to the respondents to re-engage the petitioner as Casual Labour, and more so when it is the specific case of the respondents that they are engaging casual labour on temporary basis depending on availability of work.

The writ petition is devoid of merit, and the same is accordingly dismissed.

N.V. RAMANA, J

Dated: 14 -11-2006
PVKS/*